

## REMARKS

Claim 47 and its dependent claims have been cancelled.

Claim 84 stands rejected as obvious under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson in view of Egger. The Erickson reference has been extensively discussed in prior responses to office actions. In that discussion, the applicant pointed out that the important difference between the claimed invention and Erickson is that the invention presents the hotspot which leads to a licensing web page within the document itself, that is “as a viewable part of said viewable work viewable in a single window”. By contrast, Erickson teaches that, to follow a link to a server with a licensing web page, one must access, via a separate window from the document window, data which accompanies the document but is not a part of the document as displayed in a single window.

Egger teaches that a document may include hotspots which are links to other documents or objects. There are many other earlier prior art references that could be cited showing the same thing. However, Egger does not suggest or contemplate that the documents or objects might be web pages with information about licensing the original document in which the link is located. In Egger, each link leads to a second document or object that has significance in its own right rather than merely being information about licensing terms offered for the first document. Erickson teaches that a hotspot associated with the document can lead to a licensing web page but does not contemplate or suggest that the hotspot might be presented within the document window itself. Egger says nothing about hotspots or links that lead to information about offers of licensing terms. Egger is merely an example of a link or hotspot being placed in a document, which has been well known for a long time. There is no suggestion in either Erickson or Egger that any of their aspects might be combined and no hint of any motivation to do so.

Because there are many other examples like Egger which predate Erickson, certainly it was well known to the Erickson inventors that hotspots which are links to other resources can appear in a document or any work of authorship presented on a computer display across a network. This was well known when the Erickson application was filed in 1995 because this is the first form in which “world wide web” links appeared. However, even though it was well known that hotspot links can be placed in documents, Erickson did not think of using this method to allow access to web pages for receiving offers to license a document that is presently on view on a computer screen. The applicant invented this important improvement over Erickson. It is an important improvement because the licensing hotspot presented within the document itself can be presented to the viewer without special software on the client computer, it is prominently presented to a viewer of the document so that the viewer does not have to go looking for it, and the hotspot can be presented in a standard fashion controlled solely by the publisher and not dependent upon the type of software used on the client computer to view the document.

Claim 84 is allowable for the reasons stated above. Claims 85 – 93 depend from claim 84 and are therefore also allowable.

Regarding independent claims 57, 72, 77, and those which depend from them, the office action is mistaken. The action purports to reject these claims based on § 103(a) but it cites only a single reference, Erickson. This is an improper rejection. In fact, the grounds for rejection of these claims are copied identically from a prior office action merely using a word processor to copy paragraphs. The prior office action from which the paragraphs were copied rejected these claims based on § 102, not § 103. In response to that prior office action, the applicant showed that Erickson does not disclose an essential limitation of these claims and in fact teaches away from the

claimed inventions. Specifically, the Erickson system does not provide to any client computer a unique license identifier to identify a record with information about a granted license. For the full analysis, see the applicant's previously filed response dated October 29, 2003. The Examiner has offered no further response to the arguments last presented by the applicant on these claims.

With respect to these claims, the applicant is correct and the Examiner is wrong. Anyone can see this by carefully reading Erickson. For the reasons stated in this response and the prior response, claims 57, 72, and 77 are allowable over the cited references and the claims which depend from them, 58 – 64, 73 – 76, and 78 – 80 are also allowable.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, applicant requests the Examiner contact the undersigned at the number listed below

Respectfully submitted,  
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



Jeffrey T. Haley  
Registration No. 34,834  
155 108th Avenue NE, Suite 350  
Bellevue, Washington 98004-5901  
Telephone: (425) 455-5575  
Fax: (425) 455-1046